7-6-2012

Smith, Reuben Oral History Interview

Roland di Franco

FACULTY EMERITI INTERVIEWS
UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC ARCHIVES

1972

2019

Reuben Smith (1972-1994)
Professor of History
Dean of Graduate School
Provost of Callison College

July 6, 2012

By Roland DiFranco

Transcription by Jennifer Thi Nguyen, University of the Pacific,
Department of Special Collections, Library

Subjects: Callison College program, curriculum, & problems, role and responsibilities of Graduate Dean, governance & committees, 1993 accreditation, and need for strong "Office of Development."

SMITH: I'm Reuben Smith. I came to the university in 1972 to be the provost of Callison College. I was provost for two years, and then I became Graduate Dean in 1974. Switching jobs, actually, with Otis Shao, and I remained the Graduate Dean from 1974 to 1993, I guess it was, when I retired as graduate dean. I stayed one more year as a full-time faculty member of the history department and retired in 1994. I think that's correct.

DIFRANCO: I'm the interviewer, Roland DiFranco. Today is July 6, 2012, and we're conducting this interview in Library Room 3, and we'll now begin. What brought you to Pacific?

SMITH: Several things really. My wife and I and two young kids had been at the University of Chicago for nine years, where I went after my Ph.D. on a one-year Carnegie post-doc but stayed on. And I really liked Chicago, and I not only taught there, but I ended up doing some administrative things the last two or three years that I was there. And a graduate student that I had known, who had been an assistant of mine at Chicago, had got his Ph.D. and come out to Callison College to take a job. And he contacted me and said, "There's an opening for a deanship" – or provost, as they called it then – "at the college." He knew I was interested in international things and so on. He said, would I be interested in applying? Chicago, for all of its good things, is not an easy place for a family to grow up necessarily, and my wife and I were both Californians, so we sort of longed to be in the West. We had taken every summer anyway and driven out to see our families, who were here still then. So I thought, okay, I'll apply for the job, and I got it. So that's how I came out.

DIFRANCO: All right. Good. And this was 1972?

SMITH: '72. In fact, a number of things had been happening at Pacific, which I didn't really know about. When I came out, for example, in April or May for the interview, and I met the dean of the College of the Pacific, who was Bill Binkley, when I actually got out here in July or early August, Binkley was gone, and Cliff Hand had just become the dean of the college. And Al McCrone was the one who principally had hired me. Stan McCaffrey had only been president for, I'm gonna say roughly a year. I don't remember quite how long. And McCrone, I didn't know at the time I was being hired, had been an applicant for the job, but didn't get it.

DIFRANCO: The job of provost?

SMITH: No, no, no. The job of President of the university. And so McCrone, in fact, was looking around for a presidency. But that didn't come out when I was first coming here. And McCrone explained to me that the cluster colleges were having some problems, and they needed to do some… I don't remember exactly the term, but I'll use the term straightening out… from a number of points of view, and that would be my job. So I said, yes, I thought I could do that. So indeed I found a number of problems when I came to Callison College, and those problems were also in part in the two other cluster colleges as well. And so I began doing some of that, and that did not make me very popular. So a situation came up

within a year in which I could not recommend for promotion and tenure two faculty members of Callison who were up for it, and I told the faculty and these people that's where I was. That caused an enormous stir, because the general policy at the University of the Pacific, and particularly in the cluster colleges apparently, was that everybody who came up for promotion or tenure was promoted and tenured. And so a hooha arose. A number of the Callison faculty went to President McCaffrey to complain about me, and the situation was pretty tough. It looked like I was losing my job. McCaffrey did not want any controversy. He didn't really know how to handle it, because he was not an academic anyway. We can go into that if you'd like. Anyway, the upshot was that McCrone – this was the spring of 1974 by now – McCrone had been offered the job of president of Humboldt State, and he was in the process of taking that and leaving the university. And he did me, actually, I believe, a great favor, in that he suggested to McCaffrey that Otis Shao, who had been dean of the Graduate School, become provost of Callison, and I, provost of Callison, become dean of the Graduate School. So we switched jobs. The Shaos, both of them, Marie and Otis, were well-known to the Callison faculty. Otis didn't stay long in that job. He took a deanship at Whittier was it? Or some place. Occidental maybe. Anyway, doesn't matter. He didn't stay very long, but in the meantime, the colleges were in the process of being phased out. So I became Dean of the Graduate School. It wasn't a brand-new job for me, because one of my jobs – in fact, the last two years at the University of the Chicago – had been what is called the Dean of Students of the Social Sciences Division, which meant I was responsible for the admissions, financial aid, and seeing through the graduate degree programs of the social sciences graduate students at Chicago, which included twelve social science departments like history, economics, and so on, and degree-granting committees. So I had had some of this experience anyway.

DIFRANCO: What did you think about the campus and the community here at that time?

SMITH: Well, you realize I had been born and raised in California, on the peninsula of San Francisco. This is many, many years ago. In my day, the College of the Pacific was a little place over there in Stockton. Stockton wasn't much of a town. It was a place you went through on the way to Yosemite or somewhere else. The College of the Pacific was known for some music, and actually, one student in my high school graduating class came to Pacific, which I guess by then would have been Stockton College the first two years. But it didn't have that much of an academic reputation compared with, say, Berkeley or Stanford, which is where most of my high school class went, or to the state colleges. So by 1972, my impression obviously had become a little bit different. The university was on its way to being a university, and it was growing. The idea of the effervescence of the cluster colleges in the 1960s had taken various parts of the United States by interest. People knew about the cluster colleges and they didn't know anything else about the university. As well, of course, as the fact that Amos Alonzo Stagg had come here to be coach of the football team. That's the only thing that my colleagues at the University of Chicago knew about the University. Stockton seemed to be a place where there were growing pains, but things kind of looked up in some ways. The real estate agent told us, don't buy in the city limits of Stockton, or in the Stockton School District actually, because the schools weren't very good. Buy in the Lincoln School District. Lincoln High School was considered the best high school in the area. Better than Stagg, without some of the problems that Stagg had. Although Lincoln had its own problem at the time, such as… what do you call that? Programming where you might have third period off and there was nothing for you to

do, so you might wander on into a coffee house or something at age 14 or 15? At any rate, we bought in the Stockton Unified School District, against the real estate person's suggestions. And Stockton had problems, social problems and so on, as we know, and was under court ordered busing, but we thought, okay, we can get along. But nevertheless, we had hope for Stockton – this is the long way to come to the answer – and thought, well, it's gonna move along. We can live here. We found the Stockton Symphony, for example, to be very good, and now it's absolutely first class under Peter Jaffe, but it was coming up under Kyung-Soo Won. So we also had season tickets to Pacific Theater and that kind of thing, so yeah, we found things to do here in Stockton. And good people.

DIFRANCO: How did you find the community here at Pacific at that time?

SMITH: Well, it was kind of funny. From an academic point of view, it was divided in some ways. The cluster colleges had been, I believe, almost deliberately set up against COP in some ways. For example, appointments made in history or whatever it might be in the cluster colleges were not run by the relevant College of the Pacific departments, which I think was a terrible mistake. We found that out later on, when the cluster colleges were being phased out. So there was kind of an academic rivalry on campus. There were some old guard that obviously had been here a very long time in the college, and some of them, I think, were more interested in their golf games than they were in their teaching. But by and large, the younger faculty had a real interest in what was going on, and they did, I think, in general a pretty good job. And the faculty had not been well taken care of by the university for decades, apparently. And I don't know why they put up with some of the things they put up with, but they did an excellent job with the students. And so I liked that. Administratively, there was great hope for McCaffrey at first, but that soon faded. Some of the deans, I think, turned out to be quite able. Some of the other deans were just kind of going along, as it were. And ultimately, if it were not for the faculty, I don't think the university would have gone much of any place. The faculty's responsible for a lot of things that happened, particularly later on.

DIFRANCO: Is there any particular person who helped you in those first years?

SMITH: Well, I've already said that McCrone helped me in the sense of moving me into another job, but I was not a particular confidant of McCrone. He and I were certainly always friendly, and if I went to him with something, maybe a budget thing or something like that, he would be helpful, but he and I were not necessarily friends, and I'm trying to think if there was anybody that I was particularly close friends with or drew close to in the very early years. I would say probably not. The other deans were perfectly friendly and so on, most of them, but again, we were not necessarily any more than administrative colleagues.

DIFRANCO: Did you do any teaching?

SMITH: I tried to at first. My model was the University of Chicago model, where even the president of the university taught regularly, and that's the model, by the way, that I recommended to Joe Subbiondo when I was retiring as Graduate Dean. That may be one of the reasons the graduate dean's position is defined as part-time now. But I thought that every academic dean should keep up either a little bit of academic work – research or whatever it might be on the one hand – or some kind of active teaching.

And I tried to do that for a bit, but it really didn't work out, because the administration of the university wasn't built that way. If there was a meeting called by somebody, you had to be there. You couldn't say, "Well, I'm sorry. I've got a class."

DIFRANCO: Yeah. So you were doing all administration after a while?

SMITH: Yeah.

DIFRANCO: Well, Callison was an experiment. How would you describe it? What kind of experiment was it?

SMITH: Well that's interesting that you describe it as an experiment, because an experiment suggests, well, if it doesn't work, we'll get rid of it. And that eventually is what happened, but I don't think it was set up necessarily as an experiment at the first. I have what might be called a somewhat different attitude about Bob Burns than many people have. I think Burns was – must have been. I never met him. He died well before I came on the scene. I think Burns must have been a very interesting person. A very creative person in some ways. A person with lots of ideas. Sometimes I feel he may have been a person that no idea went without his interest, and even possible attempted implementation. My sense is that Burns was not a seasoned academic. Yes, he had spent all of his life in a university, but doing other kinds of things than what an academic does. And I have fairly defined and fairly strong feelings about what an academic is and what an academic is supposed to do. And one of the things is that an academic should be practical and forward-looking and creative and somewhat conservative. So when I say practical and conservative, that sounds backward-looking, and when I say forward-looking, creative, and that sort of thing, that means new things. I don't think Burns was practical as an academic. He set things up, in some ways, I had understood, and I was told at the time, partly against COP in order to try to break open COP and make it more creative and more flexible. I'm not sure cluster colleges was the way to do that. Secondly, he was creating different kinds of colleges, and it sounded like a great idea, even if you were not trying to do anything with COP, but keep it as a core, standard, Western European/American-type liberal arts college. Callison was not set up necessarily as an international college, and many people don't understand that. When I came on, the college was not as well-defined as it should have been, I don't think, but I will put it in my words about what Callison was supposed to be. If you remember, it was the entire sophomore class, not the junior class, of Callison that went abroad. Why not a junior year abroad? The traditional junior year abroad is for students who have studied the language the first two years of the place they're going to, have studied about it, are going to become some kind of majors in some kind of subject that will involve that language and that area, so that when they graduate, they will go on and do something with that. Callison did not teach a foreign language in the freshman year, for example, to go to India. Why all this? Well, I can tell you what the theory was, but it did not work out at all. It was all… Well, anyway. What happened was, this was the late 1960s. Callison opened in 1967, I guess it was. Think of the effervescence of what student life and cultural life in America was like in the late 1960s. That includes drugs, of course. It includes anti-establishment. It includes all kinds of other things. These students, Callison students, came as freshmen and took common courses in their freshman year. They could take one or two other kinds of courses as well, say from COP, but most of the courses were Callison courses, and the freshmen were all together. Now, take these 17- and 18-year-

olds who have had this experience at Callison, which is way far out anyway, and was certainly surprising to some of the older COP types, I'm sure, the alumni and so on. Now send them abroad as a group to a place like India and keep them together in one dormitory, hotel, living group type of thing, and you have all kinds of problems – drug problems and so on. Did they learn the language? Well yes, they were supposed to learn a little bit of some language, what we would call the sort of language that many people go abroad to Europe with, which is hello, goodbye, thank you, and please, and maybe not even please and thank you. Instead of parceling them out to a real Indian cultural experience, they were the ugly Americans, kept all together in a group, such that I heard about some of the problems, so that, for example, some of the students high on something – whether it was drugs or liquor or whatever it was, doesn't matter – would be yelling out the windows of this center to the people passing by on the streets. I mean, if you can imagine… No wonder, finally the Indian government told Callison College in the late spring of '72, right as I was coming aboard, that they didn't want the program there anymore. Now, that's not talked about very much around the university, but you can see the idea. Now, having said all this, let me turn it around and put it in the best way. If you have freshmen that you bring on campus and give a good academic experience to, then you send them to a really genuine experience in a foreign country, where they get the kind of other cultural experience they're supposed to get – they are not majors, as international majors or anything like that. This is a general educational, foreign cultural experience. You bring them back the last two years, and they are on campus and can take any major they want. Let's say it's business. Let's say it's English literature. Let's say it's psychology. They're going to get a traditional, Western European/American -style education or training or whatever you want to call it in those things. They may go to graduate school in psychology or history or business or whatever it is, but they are never going to be the same kind of people in their lives, as if they had not had a really positive foreign experience, so that they look at psychology and say, "Hey, you know, a lot of this has grown out of Western European and American experience. Some of these psychology or sociology generalizations that we make don't necessarily hold in another, non-Western culture. Well, what do you know about that!" If Callison had been able to actually do that, it would have been a fascinating, liberal arts education of a different kind from the traditional liberal arts, and it would have opened up those students to do anything they wanted to do. It would be too late probably to do mathematics or physics, but the point is they could do almost anything else.

DIFRANCO: Do you know why India was chosen?

SMITH: I don't exactly, except that Margaret Cormack, who had been one of the faculty members, and a more senior faculty member, had very close contacts in India. I believe one or two other people had also. And somehow or other, they wanted a culture that was quite different from the American culture, and there was India. Now, in the time from when I was hired to the time I actually arrived, the whole foreign experience had to be switched from India to some other place. It turned out to be Japan. They hired Horace Dutton, a Pepsi-Cola executive, knowledgeable about Asia, and he became the head of the program. The program went to Japan, and it became a different kind of a program. It became a program where a number of individual students who could handle it went out and lived individually with Japanese cultural experiences. And so from my point of view, the experience in Japan was a much better experience than the Indian experience had been. And it took a while to get all that put together. It was

all sort of thrown together, but it pretty well worked out in the two years that I'm familiar with it. Okay, that's a long answer.

DIFRANCO: Oh, that's good.

SMITH: I can tell you, by the way, if I can interrupt you for just a minute, there are several problems in Burns' concept of the cluster colleges. That's what spurred this.

DIFRANCO: Go ahead.

SMITH: Okay. One of the problems was that although there were a few senior faculty or older persons, let's put it that way, in or on the faculties of some of these cluster colleges, in general, particularly at Callison, the older people were not what I would call the kind of academic – you go back to my meaning – mentors that they should have been for younger faculty. And what happened was Burns went out and pretty generally, also in COP, hired brand-new young faculty, completely untried, inexperienced except looking at academic life as a graduate student. Some of these faculty hadn't even finished their doctoral degrees yet. But anyway, they were brand new. They were green, and in spite of what the provosts and the preceptors – and some of the preceptors were quite young anyway – and the so-called senior faculty members, some of whom were kind of aloof anyway. Van Allstyne, for example, was a very nice historian, an older guy, but he was no mentor for Callison faculty. So the younger faculty in these institutions were 1960s graduate student types, and they were essentially, as far as I'm concerned, unmentored. Now, that's a pretty strong statement. Maybe I've gone a little bit too far, but that's what I saw when I came.

DIFRANCO: Yeah. Can you help us understand why Callison closed?

SMITH: Well, all kinds of reasons. There was a rumor out a little bit later on – I had no idea if it was true or not – that when McCaffrey came on as president, one or two members of the board told McCaffrey they thought that the cluster colleges ought to go for a number of reasons, particularly financial. I have no idea if that rumor's true. I didn't hear that rumor when I came in 1972. That was only later on. But it was clear McCaffrey and others had no idea what to do with the cluster colleges with all their problems. And the cluster colleges weren't very helpful to themselves, I don't think, at first anyway, about how they might solve their problems. They were underfunded. I'll tell you the story that when I came to Callison in 1972, early in the fall, September, I tried to make an appointment with Mrs. Callison to meet her, tell her I'm the new provost, and this is what we're interested in doing. We have a new program in Japan and so forth, and of course to thank her and her husband for the gift. She wouldn't see me. She refused to see me. She was angry at the university, and her secretary told me that. I only talked to the secretary. I never talked to Mrs. Callison. And that's because the money from the Callison family was not to be used for an international or a Callison-type college. It was to go somewhere else. My understanding is Dr. Ferd Callison – not Fred Callison. Ferd, F-E-R-D, Callison, who was a physician in San Francisco and had owned some real estate, wanted the money to go to some kind of medical-type situation. The university had set up a School of Medical Sciences in San Francisco, most people are not even familiar with this, different from the Dental School, and there's a lot of history there that Phil is going to put into his book, I hope. But at any rate, so the university, as far as Mrs. Callison was

concerned, had misused the Callison money. I later learned that that's not the only fund that the donor or the family was somewhat disappointed as to how the university had spent the money.

DIFRANCO: Was the enrollment a problem? How big was Callison?

SMITH: Callison was never large. I'm gonna say at the most, when I was there, maybe close to 125 to 150. The ideal would have been 250, but it got smaller and smaller. Total enrollment, including the overseas class.

DIFRANCO: And the freshman class was how big?

SMITH: Well, the freshman class, as I say, should have been roughly 50, 60, but it turned out to be more like 25, 30. That's interesting you would ask. I can't really remember the numbers. I'd have to go back and look, Roland.

DIFRANCO: Yeah. Yeah. Because when I came in '72, they were having an awful time getting students.

SMITH: Yes. And the Callison people thought, well, just the very idea should be enough. You know, you invent a better mouse trap and people will beat a path to your door. Well, that doesn't happen in general, and the university, I think, at least talking with people like Les Medford and so on, would be trying to talk up the various programs of the cluster colleges. I think the admissions people actually did a pretty good job, so far as they could. But the university wasn't putting its real, total effort behind the cluster colleges. And even if it had, they might not have worked.

DIFRANCO: Thank you. I want to talk a little bit about your administrative style and philosophy. What would you say that was?

SMITH: Well, that's a good question. I don't know. I never took any classes or theory. I've never had a business course. I've never had an education school course, so I can't tell you about theoretical administration or anything like that. I guess you'd say I had two or three things that I had just learned out of the seat of my trousers. But one, and you're making me think about it just now; I never thought about it, and I didn't think about it when I was talking with Phil. I did five years of college, that is to say, four years to a bachelor's degree, and I did a very quickie one-year master's degree, and I didn't actually finish the thesis until the following summer. But I graduated from college in 1951, and I didn't go into the service right away. You remember, the Korean War is on, draft is on, and all of this, and I was ROTC. So, since nothing seemed to be happening for the few months after I graduated, I enrolled in graduate school, because I knew I wanted to do that anyway eventually. So in 1951, I went to graduate school – this was at Berkeley – and I got a master's degree in 1952. I had been president of my living group when I was a senior. I had been what the university called a graduate resident or graduate assistant or something like that in the living group for the year I was a graduate student, and that gives you a certain kind of experiential sense of responsibility. Then I went into the Army in 1952 – the Korean War is on – as a second lieutenant. And while I didn't get sent overseas, I was given various kinds of responsibilities, as second lieutenants are, and everything from platoon leader to eventually a headquarters commandant by the time I got out of the Army. So I saw administration from the Army point of view.

Now, you can say Army administration, well, that's kind of like an oxymoron or something. But at any rate, I had had some of that, and so I was somewhat more experienced when I ended up out of the army and started to do graduate work. Then at the University of Chicago, Chicago's a very curious administratively set-up university, different from any other university that I know of. Certainly different from my graduate university as well. So you ask me what is my administrative… Well, I was doing administrative work in Chicago anyway, the last two or three years. I remarked I was Dean of Students, Social Sciences graduate division. And when I came here, partly a lot of it was what I would call personal one-on-one. Getting to know individual people, and then trying to work things together. That didn't work too well in Callison, because a number of the people on the faculty developed a dislike for me, and that continued right through. But as a graduate dean, there were two or three things that I would say would be my style. The first is that I guess you'd say I'm an administrator by walking around. You get out of the office and you walk around. You meet people, and you find out, what are the problems in this department or that department? Why are the theses often so bad? – I read every one of the master's theses that came across my desk.

DIFRANCO: Wow.

SMITH: At first, I didn't think I needed to do that. I certainly didn't do that at Chicago; that's the job of the departments. But frankly speaking, some of the quality level that was getting through was not good. So I decided I'd read every master's thesis, and I did all the time I was graduate dean. Sometimes I didn't read them all the way through. Sometimes I only had to read the first ten or twelve pages and send them back. But after all, they were going in the library on permanent deposit, and I didn't want anybody to be embarrassed 50 years later, particularly the graduate dean at the time. And the doctoral dissertations, for example, out of the School of Education, were being picked up in… what's the national dissertation library-type thing where they went on? Anyway, they were available on microfilm all over the United States. And so what was the problem? What was going on in this or that department where things weren't coming through very well? Some departments were tightly run, and the master's theses looked very good. What were the problems that graduate students had? Some graduate students had some real problems in some of the departments; others didn't. For example, in the chemistry department, I was on the end where the graduate students – in other words, my students – were foreign students whose English was not very good. From the chemistry department, or the undergraduate point of view, they had a TA whom they couldn't understand. So I'm not saying there was anything that the graduate school could particularly do. That's the problem. But wherever I could be personally at work, I tried doing that. So that's by walking around, so to speak. Persuasiveness. The problem with this graduate school, and I think it's still true, although maybe it's changed under Phil and Don DeRosa, the graduate school had no funds. So, for example, the graduate school couldn't go to a department and say, "If you think you want to hire so-and-so, it looks pretty good. I can give you some more money to attract that person." Because the graduate school should have quality control over the university. If you look across the university, the dean of the graduate school is the only dean who looks out across the university. All the other deans are interested only in their own units, so the graduate dean is in a position to be able to help the academic vice president, the provost, to work on what might

be called advancing quality, advancing scholarship, those kinds of things. But the graduate school had only a piddling – do you remember, was it $2,500 for faculty research? And for teaching incentive.

DIFRANCO: I was on the faculty research committee, and I remember grants, $200.

SMITH: Wasn't it $2,500, something like that?

DIFRANCO: Yeah. It was peanuts.

SMITH: Those were the only funds the graduate school had. That's crazy. But I couldn't get any out of people like McCaffrey or the academic vice president or Bob Winterberg or whatever. I don't think the school really knew what a graduate dean could be or do.

DIFRANCO: Back to Callison, what was your primary means of communication with the faculty there?

SMITH: Well, seeing them every day.

DIFRANCO: Walk around and talk to them?

SMITH: Yeah.

DIFRANCO: Did you write memos?

SMITH: Not many, no.

DIFRANCO: Did you have faculty discussions?

SMITH: Oh yeah. There were regular faculty meetings. There were a lot of meetings, and we all discussed things. It was very much a kind of an equal group. I mean, there was not a sense of – there was never deference, so to speak, to what might be called an administrator. Of any administration in the university, in fact. And rightly so. I mean, faculty should be responsible toward what the university needs to do, but a faculty member isn't necessarily in deference to either the President or Provost.

DIFRANCO: Okay. Which of the administrative activities do you think were very productive?

SMITH: Well, in a lot of these situations, I would have to count my productiveness or my creativeness in trying to hold things together or make a better job out of the really bad ones. Remember there were a lot of, not only were the cluster colleges being phased out, but that faculty may be phased in to various COP departments if it worked. And the departments often had an axe held over their head to take somebody that they might not, that they might have preferred to use that position to go out and hire somebody else. It wasn't just the cluster colleges but of course the marine station being shut down. There's a whole other area of the university that I think Phil is going to talk a little bit about I hope.

DIFRANCO: Did you have any administrative responsibility over the Marine Station?

SMITH: Yes, the Marine Station reported to the Graduate Dean. So, also the School of Medical Sciences in San Francisco reported to the Graduate Dean.

DIFRANCO: When did the School of Medical Sciences close?

SMITH: What?

DIFRANCO: When did it close?

SMITH: Oh! Good question. Probably sometime in the early '80s; maybe in the late '70s…early '80s. Bruce Spivey, the Dean, was an absolutely excellent person. Among other things, he was president of the American Ophthalmology Association. I mean there were interesting things going on in research in the School of Medical Sciences that very few people know about.

DIFRANCO: Did we sell it to someone? Did…

SMITH: No no…it just sort of disappeared.

SMITH: It was all part of what might have been in the Burns years of the 1960s of a medical school.

DIFRANCO: Ah Uh…yea

SMITH: But anyway that's another whole story we don't need to go into.

DIFRANCO: What did you find enjoyable about administrative…work?

SMITH: Well, theoretically academic administration – I wouldn't like ordinary administration; I mean, I can't imagine running the Veteran Affairs Office or something like that of the university but…theoretically, academic administration has a different kind of creativity from teaching and research. It's a third kind. It's what might be called *Looking to the Future and Program Building*. So, if we're here now, where should we be? And it isn't just - should we be bigger and more famous among our colleagues? No, it should be what kinds of teaching should we be doing for our undergraduates and our graduates. What kinds…where are the new fields out there? Hell, when I was a graduate student, almost nobody knew about genetics - let alone DNA. I mean, it was fruit flies, or if it was anything, that was sort of the end of it. And look what's happened – look what's happened in psychology in the last few years. In fact, the whole social sciences, when we were growing up, you and I, I don't know how aware you were of it, but I certainly was. A human being was just sort of born as almost a *tabula rasa*, and what you did in the environment to that baby and what you put in the baby's mind made him smart or dumb or whatever. And so therefore, you can solve poverty if you could only get out of the poverty. You could use the term *social engineering*, which we haven't heard for half a century, but you could social engineer and then things would be all right. Criminals would disappear because they wouldn't have to be criminals anymore. But now, look where we are at the moment when it comes to such things as genetics and inheritance, we've come a long way. That doesn't mean to say we can't do social engineering, so to speak, but we don't hear about it anymore. So creativity – it's possible. Now, you can say, "Well, geez Reuben, why did you spend 19 years being unable to be administratively creative except in so far as trying to help situations that were not good?" Well, there are all kinds of reasons. There's always hope that things might change. Things could get better if you only hang on. That's, as you know, not always a very good personal or family situation to adopt – as a point of view – but there are some

advantages. There are things that one can say inertia, in the sense of a…do I really want to pull up stakes and go somewhere else? For a while, I was active in the national graduate dean's group. That's how I met Don DeRosa, for a matter of fact, he was graduate dean of University of North Carolina Greensboro. And we used to go to national meetings together, and I was on the board and that sort of thing. And so, job opportunities looked like they might come along, and so I thought to myself on several occasions – I don't want to pull up. Maybe I'm just a stick in the mud or something.

DIFRANCO: Or persistent

SMITH: Maybe. I liked the university; I liked the faculty members; I liked the fact that the faculty are the ones who saved this university. We can go into that if you want to, but that's not necessary for me.

DIFRANCO: Um…one of the issues that's sort of dog-specific is the committee structure. Do you think it produces an effective governance here?

SMITH: I don't know because I have not been, except at one other university, namely Chicago, from the time I got my Ph.D on, so I don't know what other universities might be like. My sense is that we are overcommitted administrating, "over-committeed" here, but I think an awful lot of universities are. I think at the moment we're growing even worse from the point of view of an administration. We've become an institutional banyan tree actually, and I think that's really too bad. But…

DIFRANCO: What committees did you work with here? Graduate Studies Committee?

SMITH: The Graduate Studies Committee and the Faculty Research Committee were two of the principal ones I worked with, and the Teaching Incentive Rewards Committee. Those were the three that I worked principally with.

DIFRANCO: Do you think that they were productive?

SMITH: I don't know. I mean, you were a part of the Faculty Research Committee, Roland. Do you think it was productive? In a sense, what little you had – you did – your committee did a very good job of trying to find people who were really worthy, for whom seed money could be a real help. Well that's…

DIFRANCO: The hope was that the seed money would lead to the ability to go outside the community/university for other research.

SMITH: Yes, exactly. That was the theory that the upper people of the university had that – "always go outside if you possibly can." Well, were they effective? I don't know. Indirectly, well the other committee of course, the administrative committee was the University's Executive Policy Committee which met once a month - President, Vice President, Deans.

DIFRANCO: What about that committee? How effective was it?

SMITH: Well, I don't know. It was a chance for some deans to very carefully say a few things that they thought a few people ought to hear, but I don't know how really effective it was. We went through a period of time when I think the president of the Board of Regents and the president and the president's

assistant and one or two other people who work for the president were essentially running things. That's my view.

DIFRANCO: Was it a top-down situation?

SMITH: I think so. In so far as things could run. But you remember a number of funny things, I mean they're funny in the sense of comical – I'd guess you say now. But they used to gripe all kinds of people. Do you remember that we used to have yearly budget meetings? So the annual budget for the following year would be announced, and that would have to do with faculty raises or no faculty raises, and it would have to do with allocations of money in the very general and grossest/largest sense. So, what we would see in that budget every year would be the fact that in the previous year there had been a deficit. So, in the coming year's budget however there was no deficit. Why? Well, because the advancement – the institutional advancement people – the fund raising people – instead of raising "X" amount, were going to raise roughly double that in the following year. Even though their track record had not shown there was going to be any increase at all, and that's the way the budget was balanced. Well that's – you know – who was doing that? Well, a few people were doing that. The Executive Policy Committee wasn't doing that. Nor was long range planning, in the old long range planning sense. Remember there was such a committee – The Long Range Planning Committee.

DIFRANCO: Yes, yes, yes. Let's talk a little bit about the people at Pacific. Who were the ones who were most memorable to you?

SMITH: Well, it depends on why. [laughs]

DIFRANCO: [laughs] Any way you want to take it.

SMITH: Well, I don't know. One of the reasons I think I'm attracted to academia is that there are a lot of characters there, and even in the administrations, and I suppose I'm one too. I don't know. Slightly nerdy types - I like those kinds of people. And, you know I don't know how to answer that question Roland. Different people attracted me for different reasons. For example, for years there were a couple of us, including Dale McNeal, who, I went out on McNeal's field trips. Sometimes with the students; Sometimes just where he went out collecting. And then there was a group that was doing backpacking, and I like backpacking. Cliff Hand was one of the backpackers a little bit. And that involved people like Jesse Marks. I've been backpacking with Jesse Marks a lot. And so, there was that aspect of life, and even those people are characters. Dale is a character. But I was attracted, you might say, in that sort of sense. There were people – we've always been interested in music. My wife is a music graduate and so on. And so, we've always done things with the conservatory or the Stockton Symphony or the various music groups around Stockton and elsewhere. And so, some of the conservatory people turned out to be interesting and attractive, and there were a few of the deans that we did social things with and other things we didn't – we were friendly – as I say, but we didn't do certain things. I have always thought of myself as a faculty member who also did administration rather than an administrator. But I don't know if I was accepted that way. I don't think I was by some people.

DIFRANCO: Who were the people who were most helpful and supportive to you as provost of Callison?

SMITH: You're speaking particularly of Callison days?

DIFRANCO: Let's talk about Callison, and then we'll talk about the Graduate School.

SMITH: Helpful and supportive. Well, I think basically McCrone was helpful and supportive. There were a couple of my fellow deans who said, "Reuben you're just asking for trouble. You should just go along." And I personally thought I couldn't do that. So I risked my job, and I lost it. Who was helpful…I think there were one or two of the faculty members who quietly would come to me and say – well, there were several faculty members who came and said, "You made the right decision Reuben, but it was the wrong thing to do." And after all, they were friends of those faculty I didn't support for promotion and tenure. That's a funny thing to say – I hadn't thought about that but that's right – that's what they were saying to me.

DIFRANCO: And was there at the Graduate School? Was there anyone who was supportive?

SMITH: Well, I mean people like you guys who were doing the best you could for the University. You and Rosie and some others were trying to hold up some kind of standards to what was going on in the university, and so you didn't say to me "well I'm not going to serve on the Faculty Research Committee 'cause there's no money and it's stupid and the university isn't cooperating and we just need to whatever; I mean in the sense – we were all just going along the best we could to make what we could out of the way things were. And it wasn't all that bad all the time; and good teaching was going on.

DIFRANCO: Let's talk about some individual groups. How would you - you gave a little bit of a description of the students at Callison. Do you want to add anything to that?

SMITH: Well, they were bright, creative, full of beans...What would you expect of freshmen in the later 1960s? A number of them had prospered. By prospered, I mean, you know, really learned things and got a lot out of their Indian experiences. You might say in spite of the way it was run. And I think a few faculty members did too.

DIFRANCO: Ok, that was the next question. Which faculty – how would you describe the faculty of Callison?

SMITH: [chuckles] Some were extremely flaky. And one of them had gotten tenure the year before I came; and everybody said, "He shouldn't have gotten tenure but he did." Fortunately, for the university and Callison, he finally left. That was a couple of years after I had became graduate dean. He was a positive detriment. Others were kind of flaky. Others kind of went along. One or two were kind of aloof from all these things because they realized that – Well, Callison it might have been a good idea; It wasn't working out in practice.

DIFRANCO: Were there any stars?

SMITH: Well, for example, I had known of Steve Anderson before I came – while I was still in Chicago – because of his work on the Iranian amphibians and so on for the Cambridge History of Iran. I mean – My God! That's a world publication. And so, he was the only person I knew of besides the graduate student

– my former research assistant. There were people who were doing things. Gill Schedler is a very interesting person for example, and he has written poetry. He's done it all of his life. He is a very good teacher from what I understand, and as I say – a very interesting person. But he had an interesting Indian experience, that I've never really talked to him about; how he now looks at that. I don't know how to answer you. The traditional scholarship, besides Steve Anderson, I'm trying to think who else was doing traditional scholarship; not many people.

DIFRANCO: Ok. Anything you'd like to say that characterized the administration at that particular time? Callison?

SMITH: The Callison administration?

DIFRANCO: No, the administration of the university vis a vis Callison.

SMITH: Well that was as I say, McCaffrey was new, McCrone was trying to do what the university needed to do and not just for the cluster colleges but elsewhere, but wasn't able to and left. And neither McCaffrey nor Dochterman, very nice man, was an academic. Cliff Hand was sort of working as best Cliff Hand could, as the Dean of COP, but there really wasn't much he could do, and then he became AVP.

DIFRANCO: Anything about the staff of Callison?

SMITH: Oh, the staff. For example, secretaries and so on were fabulous people. And as the staff generally here, I have known only a very few [eight-balls] among the senior staff people at this university, and if it weren't for the staff people, a lot of these things at the cluster colleges and elsewhere would've just gone to pieces. I think particularly of Ruth Rubinstein and Lily Tanji, Lily by the way, had been I think in the sixth grade when she got relocated to a World War II internment camp. And she had won the American Legion prize two or three months earlier for "Why I Am Proud to be an American" – talk about irony. Anyway, they were first class, and they knew a lot of the goings-on that I didn't even want to know about. And they were not snitches in any way, but they knew exactly, and they knew how to tip me off to keep me from falling into a terrible abyss; even though I was falling into holes.

DIFRANCO: How about the Regents at that time?

SMITH: Well, I don't have much good to say. I'm sorry to say but they were...the Regents of the time I think were very nice people who didn't really know what being a Regent was. There were a few people who came on in the '70s who had an idea of what a regent should be; for example, Bob Haas, but he didn't last. And, I mean, here we have the chairman of the Board of Regents in his colored tennis shoes out walking along the sidelines of a football field. Come on, that remark of mine probably won't last in this interview. Anyway…

DIFRANCO: How about the University donors? You've already talked about the Callison family. Any other experience you've had with them?

SMITH: No, I had no direct experience with donors. Some of them obviously got what they wanted and were happy with the way things worked out, but as I understand, there was a tendency even with McCaffrey and Dochterman, I suppose, not just Burns. Anyway, McCaffrey and Winterberg to kind of use the money as they needed or thought they needed.

DIFRANCO: Were you in touch with any alumni of note?

SMITH: No, not of note. Generally speaking, my reputation with Callison was such that the graduating students, for example, by 1974 were not really in favor of me. And so, I tended to kind of stay away. And so, I have not participated – after all, I was only there for two years – I have not participated in Callison alumni activities and that sort. A number of Callison alums have done some very interesting things by the way.

DIFRANCO: Anything you want to talk about in particular?

SMITH: No, I guess not. I, one of my things, and I did talk about this with Phil, was the time when the Regents were coming to a real problem. This was the late '80s and early '90s. OK, there's one specific thing I'll talk about. Dale Reddig had been chair of the Regents for a brief length of time, and you remember the regents were about to do him in. So, three people were allowed to speak to the Board of Regents at a meeting. I believe it was in May or June. Skip Scully was one, I was another, and I forget who the third person was. So we had our say, and they listened quietly, and we left. And then they went ahead and got rid of Reddig. I'm perfectly pleased that I was able to speak. Even though, it was ineffective apparently, and we knew it was going to be anyway. Not long after that time, and I'm sorry my chronology is mixed up, Bob Monagan became chair. Now did he become chair after Reddig or was there…OK, right after Reddig I was over in my office in Wendell Philips – gee it must have been in '93?'94? After I left the Deanship and became a faculty member for one year only – full year. Fulltime faculty member. My phone rang and it was Bob Monagan on the other end. Bob said, "Do you have a minute Reuben?" I said, "Yes, surely." He said, "I'd like to talk to you." I said, "Of course." And I got ready and said, "Where are you?" He said, "No, I'll come over to your office. Where are you?" Anyway, upshot is, he came over to my office, and we sat and talked for an hour. That was one of the cleverest political things that a politician, lifelong politician, could have done. Monagan knew exactly how to handle people, what he was doing, and what he was doing was – he wasn't trying to mollify me necessarily. He was trying to get a hold on where people like us, and others in the university like my thinking, were. Not necessarily just asking the radicals, if you will. And I thought, what a great guy that showed Monagan to be!

DIFRANCO: This one other situation in which I think you were involved in. It was the preparation of a report for…

SMITH: Yes, that's the other thing I wanted to mention to you.

DIFRANCO: I wanted to give you a chance to talk about it.

SMITH: OK, I'm going to give you my version. I've given it to Phil, and I'm perfectly proud to talk about it now. I told Phil if he really wants to get the complete version he needs to interview Lee Fennel if Lee is willing to talk, and Joe Subbiondo whom he has interviewed and who has more or less apparently, I don't want to quote Phil, but my understanding from what Phil told me was that Joe more or less corroborated this. And I'm actually proud of this role, and I'll tell you why. When the general accreditation came up for the university in 1991, is that right? Atchley was president. And I believe that we had basically the same board members we had had for quite awhile. And you also know that I was – actually I served two full terms and a partial term on the WASC board. So I've actually been a WASC commissioner for seven years or something like that, which is much longer than usual. And I had known WASC accreditation process pretty well. I've been a team leader and all that as well as serving on many accreditation visit teams and so on. And I knew Ralph Wolfe very well. Ralph knew that the university was not in good shape. So, Joe Subbiondo and I, aided and abetted I'm sure by a few other people, said, "let's have a real accreditation, let's do a real self-study. One that lays it all out. And then, when we do that, let's tell Ralph that we want a gold plated visiting committee. National – not necessarily regional." And Lee Fennel wrote the report, he did the actual writing. I mean some of us contributed parts to the report, faculty contributed parts and all that. But Lee was the editor, Lee put it all together. And you may remember, I think you had something to do with looking at the report and so on. You must've…. Anyway, I think it's 1991 but I'm not sure.

DIFRANCO: [ ] was chair of the council '89, so just maybe thereafter.

SMITH: Could it have been '93? Anyway, and so we wrote a – as far as I'm concerned – a frank and candid report. Here's where we are and here's where our troubles are. And then these people came in. You remember the – somebody who was what – president of AT&T and somebody from one of the east coast universities or colleges. I mean there were people from all over the country who were top drawer people – who came in. And particularly – was John Stein a member of that committee?

DIFRANCO: Yes. Yes he was.

SMITH: Ok. I thought he was. And actually some members of that committee, possible members by name – in other words, candidates to be members of the visiting committee, were suggested. And so, WASC – I won't say Ralph – made up the visiting team, and they came in and they read the report. But the other thing – and we didn't necessarily think this was going to be the case. In fact, we thought – Joe and I – at any rate, that maybe this report was going to get pretty heavily edited by Atchley and the Board of Regents as soon as they saw it. But you know you know what? I don't think they ever read it.

DIFRANCO: Yes, I thought you were going to say that.

SMITH: Really! They couldn't have read it and let it go that way. So, they were surprised that the team said, "That's an excellent report." Well, maybe not an "excellent" report but in any way, they said the report covers everything. We haven't found anything that the report had not talked about, which is not often usual. You know lots of time if universities should try to hide things, they don't say things. Well, the report resulted in what was a basic shake-up. And that's what I think began the change on the regents and – I mean there are people who tried to credit Atchley with trying to change the board, and I

think maybe there might be something to that but I'm not an Atchley fan. And I don't know that there's that much to be said in regard to supporting Atchley vis-à-vis the board. But at any rate that started the whole change, and I'm very proud of that.

DIFRANCO: What would you say is the primary recommendation that came out of that accreditation report?

SMITH: That the board…principally…well, there are all kinds of recommendation that came out, as you know, but the principal one that really hit hard was – Yes, you got financial problems; Yes, you have all these other kinds of problem – administrative and otherwise, but until the board understands what a Board of Regents really has to be for an institution, you're not going to go anywhere. I think that's the upshot of what the report said – that's what I got out of it.

DIFRANCO: And I think that was a stimulus of leadership. It took a decade or so for…

SMITH: Oh yeah. It takes a long time. Afterall, we're not turning around a row boat. We're turning around a tanker or an aircraft carrier.

DIFRANCO: Right. Fine, that's good. Thank you. What would you say, in these years now, what's the general relationship between the faculty and the administration in the years of the '70s and '80s?

SMITH: Well, in some ways you could kind of generally characterize that I think as somewhat adversarial. That doesn't mean to say it was always active adversarial necessarily, but in general, I think the faculty did not think that the administration was doing for the university what the administration should do. Although, I think from a practical point of view everybody realized, even some administrators realized, that maybe given the situation, we were doing more or less what we could do. I don't know. I'd like to ask you that question. How would you characterize it?

DIFRANCO: I agree with you that it was somewhat adversarial.

SMITH: Do you think the administration was doing what it could do?

DIFRANCO: I don't really know about that because I've interviewed the Head of Development, and I know that basically they were starting from the ground up to create a development office, so we didn't really have a good development office at that time.

SMITH: That's right. We didn't have any development office, I understand, under Burns.

DIFRANCO: Right...and I think the administrative aspect of it was barely functional but without enough funds to do things – not able to provide the incentives to become better.

SMITH: But an awful lot of these people didn't think very widely. They didn't really have broad horizons. One of the enthusiasms that I had heard about McCaffrey when I first came aboard in '72 was he's from the Bay Area and he's been with the Bay Area Regional Development Association – I don't remember its proper name before he came to the University, the greater Chamber of Commerce, so to speak. And he's going to bring Bay Area financial interest to the university. Well, that was crazy. Bay Area interests

have interest in Bay Area things – most of them. And they were mostly Cal and Stanford graduates – not to speak of USF, and so on. So anyway, we weren't thinking in the right way, and some of the deans were fairly parochial, even if they came from other places, they weren't thinking widely.

DIFRANCO: Some of these questions we covered already. Programs you've been involved in – which ones were successful and which were not, and controversial issues. Are there any other controversial issues you'd like to talk about?

SMITH: Oh, gee, I don't know. There were maybe a lot in some ways but…

DIFRANCO: Anything that stick in your mind that is important?

SMITH: Nothing I could think of at the moment that we haven't covered. Controversial – no, I can't think of any. Can you? Can you prompt me?

DIFRANCO: Well, what about the whole salary situation where…?

SMITH: Well, I'm assuming that we're looking at a university that didn't know how to become something more than third class or second class for a number of reasons. It didn't know how to figure out how to do things. As you say, how to raise money, how to think more widely than very parochially, and all these [kinds of things]. So of course, there are a lot of issues we haven't talked about. My sister, who was a high school counselor at Burlingame High School on the peninsula, used to razz me when I first came saying well she had students that she could recommend to various colleges and universities, but then when she had a student who couldn't get into some of those colleges and universities, she always knew a university where they could get in. And so, quality of students as well as faculty salary, I mean there are a number of issues we could talk about. What I would call the financial magic show – so to speak – that we put on for ourselves instead of really looking at things the way they really were. All those were issues, so yes, salary is an issue, but yes, I think there are others – we haven't talked about maybe, but they're in the background because we were not really a very good university at that time. I think we're getting better.

DIFRANCO: I can remember years when salary increments were based on enrollment, and the reports on enrollment did not appear until late in the fall, so salary did not come until late in the fall. An unusual exhibition of lack of information.

SMITH: But that's the magical sleight of hand, so to speak. That's like the annual budget reports.

DIFRANCO: Did you have much contact with students as an administrator?

SMITH: Not directly – no. One of my administrative styles, by the way, was that administration – I meant to mention this when I was talking about administration; administration exists for the students. That is to say, the registrar's office should find procedures which make it easiest for the students and the faculty to do the kinds of reports – if you want to call it that – or business that is the registrar's business. Same thing is true at the graduate school. So for example, if a student walks in, it doesn't matter what somebody behind the desk needs to finish doing. You put that down and you get up and you say, "May I

help you?" If it looks like there's a lot of people on the desk, for the two or three secretaries who are there, then the dean comes out and says, "May I help you? I may not know exactly what I am doing, but if I do it wrong, I'll fix it. But anyway, how can I help you?" Then I have to find out what I'm really supposed to do from the people who know. But students are first. That's what we're here for.

DIFRANCO: But you didn't do any teaching or advising per se?

SMITH: I did a little teaching, but very little. I tried to do it at first, then it didn't work out very well. I would do guest lectures lots of times, and one time Cort Smith, Jerry Hewitt and I, somewhat strange bedfellows by the way, did a course for – I guess it was the School of International Studies; I don't remember. What Cort was doing it – it had to do with world history. And we participated in this course, and I found it a lot of fun. And I think the students liked it too.

DIFRANCO: Any particular student activities that stand out in your mind? Protests or celebrations?

SMITH: No, there were celebratory activities when we even put together a little brass band, on the redwood deck with a celebration of a presidential departure. I think you were there weren't you?

DIFRANCO: I don't remember it – maybe yes.

SMITH: That was sort of the turnover of the regime.

DIFRANCO: Do you think student attitudes have changed much through the years?

SMITH: You know, I don't know. My sense is they have from what reports I'm hearing. For example, in the 1960s, if you tried to tell students something they didn't want to hear, they would tell you that to your face. Particularly in the humanities and the social sciences and so on. They might or might not do whatever they were supposed to do. We then went through a period of time when students in the later '70s and '80s, and it could be somewhat of a change in the kind of students coming to the University - I don't know - when they just seemed to write everything down. And nothing was really getting processed necessarily except what was coming from the class onto the student's paper.

DIFRANCO: Is this post-Vietnam?

SMITH: Yes. And now, I'm told that students come woefully unprepared, and actually, I taught for two or three years – I taught Mentor I when it was first being started out, and I found it a very interesting course, very exciting and I liked the way it was done. Later on, they made changes, and I didn't like where it was going. But anyway, I had some students who – you remember in Mentor I when it was first done, we did papers every two weeks or something like that, they had to write four pages – it took me a half an hour to go through each students' paper. And sometimes I would rewrite the entire opening paragraph. It was to try to show them these things. And mark them down, and I was giving students "C," "C-," "Ds" in their papers. I had two students come to me, two women students come, - I'm sorry to tell you that they were education majors or thought that they were going to be education majors – in tears with their papers because they had never gotten anything but "As" and maybe a few "B+" in high school when they wrote their papers. They were misspelled. The grammar was awful. They couldn't write an

argumentative or, in other words, expository paragraph to say here is what I'm going to argue, so to speak, and here's how I'm going to argue it. And they couldn't imagine, and I was so frustrated that I said, "Well I'm very sorry, but I'm afraid your high school has let you down." And they didn't want to hear that. So I guess I wasn't a very good teacher, because I lost my cool or something. Anyway, I understand that's the kind of students we regularly have now - at least a number of them. That's what the faculty tells me. So yes, I think there's been a real general change.

DIFRANCO: The next section is on progress and evolution. What issues were you involved in that were important to the growth and development of Pacific?

SMITH: Well, you remember the first decade or more was not growth and development. It was retraction and retrenchment there were a few programs. For example, I don't know how the engineering school feels about this, so I don't think I can comment very much on it, but there was a time when the Lawrence Livermore Lab wanted some of its people to have a Master's degree in electrical engineering. And Bob Heyborne was very much in favor of it, and a good argument was made for it. I was supportive of that and it did, in fact, go through the Academic Council. And the program went for a while. I have to tell you I was not supportive of a Master's in Business Administration, but I was leaving the graduate school by then anyway. We already talked about the retrenchment. I'm sorry but I can't think of any growth programs. Can you at the moment?

DIFRANCO: It's not an academic program, but the reform of the regents…

SMITH: Well, of course. No, I was thinking about academic programs that related to the graduate school. I can tell you that twice I was in talks and let the people in the School of Education know, actually under two different deans, that I was not in favor of a Ph.D. in education, but we should keep the Ed. D. The Ed. D. is, as you know, a professional type degree. It is a degree, as all professional type degrees are, that should allow its holder to understand and make use of research in action. But not necessarily to conduct a long- term program using/doing a lot of original research. That's a Ph.D.

DIFRANCO: Where do you think the energy is coming from for progress and evolution at Pacific?

SMITH: Well now, I mean after, from DeRosa on, I think it's coming from the upper administration. The regents abetted by, supported by an enthusiastic, generally enthusiastic, faculty core.

DIFRANCO: So, now a tough question. Did Pacific meet your expectations?

SMITH: I don't know Roland. I've changed a lot. After I - so to speak - lost my job, that is to say became graduate dean, I got a feeler from Chicago a few months later. It was just before Christmas of '74. "Heard you had a change out there from what you went out for. Would you be interested in coming back?" So we thought about that a little bit, and the answer was no. I had expectations for what Pacific might be. I think those expectations are now being fulfilled, that has nothing to do with me, because I've been gone now for fourteen years or however long it's been. Anyway, you know it's kind of like child-raising in a sense maybe. Maybe that's a very bad analogy. You have a child and the child has a lot of potential. There are things you would like the child to do because it would be easier on the child to have

done them that way, but the child doesn't necessarily do them that way, but the child eventually realizes his or her potential eventually, as I said. Maybe in a different way. I'm not trying to be zen-like. I'm just trying to say I have to think about this.

DIFRANCO: That's a good analogy. Do you think the external perception of Pacific academic quality is changing?

SMITH: For some schools, I think yes and for some departments. I can know that. Well, I used to watch it as graduate dean. If we had students who went on either from the bachelor's program to a graduate school or from a master's program to another program. What schools do they get into, how many went, and those kinds of things. I used to keep an unofficial track of that. And I understand from what little I hear around the faculty that – our better students are getting into better programs now.

DIFRANCO: Two last questions. The first one is about the community. What contributions has Pacific made to the greater community?

SMITH: Well, I'll tell you one weird thing, and that is, I think it has proved to the Stockton community by dropping football that you don't have to have football to have a university in your community or to have your community do whatever it's going to do. Or particularly, it shows that when the community said "you have football and we'll support it" and they didn't, then when we didn't have football, well football just sort of disappeared. That's a weird kind of thing. Obviously, we contributed greatly to the community. I don't know about these new specific kinds of activities that President Eibeck has in mind to do and how successful they might be and what we're doing and all the rest. Business school has a kind of a local business institute and all that kind of stuff. Those are specific kinds of things. In general, I think a college is a good thing for a community, and I think the University of the Pacific has been very good for Stockton. I don't think Stockton always appreciates what it has here.

DIFRANCO: Would you say that town-gown relations have improved, stayed the same, or gotten worse?

SMITH: I don't know. They seem to change in relationship somehow or other. I mean you can say "What's most recently happened?" Well, most recently happened we got our new residence hall situation delayed by the downtown hotel guy. Is the downtown hotel guy raising questions that hadn't been raised before? And where the approval process has been going through for the planning commission and all that in the same way and suddenly these things come up because – what does he want? More students in his hotel? I don't know what he wants. I mean, why did this occur? We did everything that we had normally done.

DIFRANCO: Right. Last question. Anything we haven't covered that you would like to talk about?

SMITH: No, I can't think of any. I mean, I think of some of the antics that have gone on and that sort of thing. Some of the stories I heard about India. Those kinds of things. Since I don't have any direct knowledge of them myself, I think we'll just let it die. But that didn't help the college –Callison College.

DIFRANCO: OK. We're terminating this interview at approximately twelve o'clock.